

Date: Sat, 6 Nov 93 04:30:17 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #419
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 6 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 419

Today's Topics:

 3rd party Flame for Robert (2 msgs)
 info on cellular mods - illegal? YES!
 new groups (2 msgs)
 Why does practice work for you but not for me?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1993 01:57:02 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 3rd party Flame for Robert
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Subject: 3rd party Flame for Robert
From: Gene Wolford, genew@teleport.com
In article <2b93j4\$5u4@kelly.teleport.com> Gene Wolford,
genew@teleport.com writes:

>
>3rd party traffic From: David Simmons <davids@ims.com>
>
>Robert says:
>>:

>>: | Anyone who cannot cope with Morse code is not fully human. At best
|
>>: | he is a tolerable subhuman who has learned to wear shoes, bathe,
and |

```

>>: | not make messes in the house.
|
>>:
-----
>
>David says:
>
>Listen, Einstein,
>Anyone who can't solve a second-order nonlinear differential
>equation doesn't deserve to occupy the same galaxy with those of us who
>can.
>That includes every ham I ever met - especially the old fuddy-duddy
>Repeter
>Peters at the ARRL.
>
>I'll bore myself with your pathetic Morse Code right after you learn
>enough
>electromagnetic field theory to be able to accurately plot the radiation
>patterns of the antennas you're always dribbling ignorantly about. As
>long as
>all you hams can do is concoct nomographs and solder tubing together and
>then
>publish self-congratulatory nonsense in your pathetic antenna handbooks,
>don't
>bother crawling out of your sandbox to distract the thought processes of
>intelligent life forms with your pathetic wailings.
>
>David Simmons
>Davids@ims.com
>
>
>
>
>
>
>--
>   Those who beat their swords into plowshares
>   are destined to plow for those who don't.
>   genew@teleport.com
>Please direct flames to: genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere

```

Very good! You know, when I first started reading this board, I thought the *theory tests* they were arguing about must include things like "Demonstrate that Maxwell's Equation's are in fact covariant under Lorentz transformations and hence that Einstein's postulates are not contradicted." Much to my surprise, what is considered theory is "What is a capacitor?," or "What is an Oscillator?" I suppose that if you consume your neuron's by functioning as a human modem in a 150 year old

telegraph modulation scheme, this seems like *Theory*. Oh, well, self delusions are the best kind.

Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety.

- Benjamin Franklin

Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1993 03:00:22 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 3rd party Flame for Robert
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Nov4.015702.8414@newsgate.sps.mot.com> Jim Jaskie, jim_jaskie@tempeqm.sps.mot.com writes:
>Very good! You know, when I first started reading this board, I thought
>the *theory tests* they were arguing about must include things like
>"Demonstrate that Maxwell's Equation's are in fact covariant under
>Lorentz transformations and hence that Einstein's postulates are not
>contradicted." Much to my surprise, what is considered theory is "What
>is a capacitor?," or "What is an Oscillator?" I suppose that if you
>consume your neuron's by functioning as a human modem in a 150 year old
>telegraph modulation scheme, this seems like *Theory*. Oh, well, self
>delusions are the best kind.

Jim,

I notice you have taken a more direct approach to dealing with the code free discussions on the net. I bet this time you'll get a reply or two. I have noticed that Robert and Jeffrey have been burning up the bandwidth telling all of us who find learning code unworthy of their own available free time that we are lower than dog desecration. I have stated before and will one more time: "Is CW the best test we can find to honor the hobby of amateur radio." There are many aspects of the hobby, and it make the full use of the spectrum dependent on the ability to slowly decipher a message modulated in beeps seems pretty silly. There is much to learn and enjoy in Amateur Radio for all those who want to, but to limit the HF spectrum to those who passed a CW test is pretty weak. I agree with the poster (Gary Coffman?) who indicated the reason the band was not anialated in the same means as CB was the refusal of those who play by the rules to talk to those who don't. Pure and simple. It's not the requiremnet of CW or anything like it.

To Jeffrey and Robert: a class in persuasion might assist you in not alienating every ham and non-ham you come in contact with.....

Rick Aldom

Code Free & proud of it!!

Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1993 01:46:57 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: info on cellular mods - illegal? YES!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Nov2.001954.16911@pixar.com> Bruce Perens,
bruce@pixar.com writes:

>I think you don't really believe your own argument, as your signature
leads
>me to think you simply like to get people annoyed. Either that, or you
really
>haven't been thinking things through.

Hey Bruce,
I think you have stumbled onto it!!! Robert has demonstrated the fact he
doesn't think. He writes out some gibberish and then posts it. The
horse shit analogy seems to apply to most everything that he posts.

Rick Aldom
Code Free & becoming proud of it.

Date: 6 Nov 93 07:54:52 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: new groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

"...and thus complying with both the letter and the spirit of the law..."

What law -- passed by the House and Senate -- requires a code test for HF?

"...as I and thousands of other amateurs have done."

Irrelevant. Might doesn't make right.

"Stop whining."

How is it whining to point out that something needs to be changed?

Date: 5 Nov 1993 08:32:38 -0800
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!ornews.intel.com!
ornews.intel.com!not-for-mail@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: new groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <DXaicc1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (Robert)
writes:

>And, don't forget:

>rec.radio.amateur.nocode.cbbers

> --Robert

There already exists rec.radio.cb where I'm sure a few RiffRaff can be
found who may be eligible for some Morris Missionary salvation.

I suggest adding:

rec.radio.amateur.robert

The .policy group is now getting too big for me to read much anymore.
And to think I used to worry that .policy was underutilized!

--
zardoz@ornews.intel.com WA7LDV

Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1993 15:39:11
From: noc.near.net!lard.ftp.com!tiedye.wco.ftp.com!andy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Why does practice work for you but not for me?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <uuBFcc4w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (Robert)
writes:

>genew@teleport.com (Gene Woford) writes:

>> Robert (robert@amanda.jpunix.com) wrote:

>> : -----
>> : | Anyone who cannot cope with Morse code is not fully human. At best |
>> : | he is a tolerable subhuman who has learned to wear shoes, bathe, and |
>> : | not make messes in the house. |
>> : -----

Actually I'm a Martian, and the only reason I care about this is because
according to FCC rules, operation from my flying saucer while over the USA

requires an Extra Class license, since the country has no reciprocal agreement with Mars. :^) :^) :^) :^)

>With the changes our licensing structure has undergone within the past
>few years, NOTHING surprises me anymore.

Does it surprise you that they finally let people get licensed without learning something so primitive as Morse Code? I've read that there was a time when ham radio was on the leading edge.

>Perhaps you wouldn't be beating your head against the proverbial wall,
>if you weren't beating your thumbs against the microphone talking on
>Two Meters.

I do it because it seems like something that would be fun (primitive as it is) if I could ever master it.

Most of us use 2 meters portable or mobile.
I suppose you work CW while driving???

Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1993 17:49:59
From: noc.near.net!lard.ftp.com!tiedye.wco.ftp.com!andy@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CFtzpA.FBn@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>, <andy.24.00104545@wco.ftp.com>,
<1993Nov3.231222.10100@Csl.i.Stanford.EDU> p
Subject : Re: Why does practice work for you but not for me?

In article <1993Nov3.231222.10100@Csl.i.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.i.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
> If you can touch type, you can do CW.

These skills seem totally unrelated to each other.
Touch-typing does not require the "write-behind" ability, that is the ability to commit one thing to short-term memory while typing something completely different.

You can type it at whatever pace you want, and pause whenever you want, so you don't need write-behind for typing.

Touch-typing something that somebody else was reading to you, fast, without any breaks, might be analagous.

I never had any trouble learning to touch-type.
Write-behind, in any form, is a skill I do not have, and do not know how to acquire.

Most of the advice has been of the form "just do it"
which presupposes that I know how to do it in the first place.

Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1993 12:34:38
From: news.centerline.com!noc.near.net!lard.ftp.com!wco.ftp.com!andy@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov3.231222.10100@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<andy.32.0011D5D1@wco.ftp.com>, <1993Nov4.175418.16515@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: Why does practice work for you but not for me?

In article <1993Nov4.175418.16515@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>>Touch-typing does *NOT* require the "write-behind" ability, that is the
>>ability to commit one thing to short-term memory while typing something
>>completely different. [emphasis added, since it appears you misread it]

>Um, but that's precisely what one does when copying CW.

Write-behind? Yes. I know. That is the problem!

>with touch typing, you have a lot more control over the speed of the incoming
>data stream.

Complete control, yes. That is why I can do it.

>flush the cache, and start over again.

But that takes time, after which time it is time to flush the cache *again*.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #419

